United Nations A/64/327*

General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 August 2009

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session
Item 72 (a) of the provisional agenda**
Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance: strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations

Central Emergency Response Fund

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report on the Central Emergency Response Fund is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/139 of 11 December 2008 and covers activities from 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. Within the reporting period, the Emergency Relief Coordinator allocated $374.3 million from the Fund to implement life-saving activities in 50 countries/territories. Fourteen humanitarian agencies received funds directly from the Fund to address emergency needs and many projects were carried out in partnership with non-governmental organizations. The Fund has strengthened its operations and has continued its role as a critical component of humanitarian response. To maintain and improve the effectiveness of the Fund, increased political and financial support is required from Member States, particularly in the light of the negative effects of the global economic crisis and other global trends.

* Reissued for technical reasons.
** A/64/150.

09-49281* (E) 280909

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The preset report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/139 of 11 December 2008, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to it a detailed report on the use of the Central Emergency Response Fund. The report covers activities from 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009.

II. Overview of the Fund

Funding commitments[1]

2. Building on three years of operations, the Central Emergency Response Fund continued to enable prompt, life-saving action and to support inadequately funded, essential humanitarian response activities. During the reporting period, the Emergency Relief Coordinator, as Fund Manager,[2] approved grants totalling US$ 374.3 million for United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes and the International Organization for Migration (IOM)[3] to support relief operations in 50 countries/territories. This amount was made up of grants totalling $274.5 million through the rapid response window and $99.8 million through the underfunded window. Table 1 provides an overview of grants allocated during the reporting period.

Table 1
Central Emergency Response Fund allocations[a] (1 July 2008-30 June 2009)[b]

	Total grant allocations
Amount approved	$374.3 million
Number of recipient countries/territories	50
Number of projects funded	475
Average project amount	$788 000

[a] For the purposes of the present report, "allocations" refer to fund amounts allotted to specific countries/territories or regions by the Emergency Relief Coordinator.

[b] Financial figures reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.

3. Funding through the rapid response window was aimed at jump-starting humanitarian response efforts to address crises as efficiently and effectively as possible. A breakdown of rapid response grants shows that projects in response to protracted conflict-related emergencies (including support services for refugees and internally displaced persons) received the highest total allocations at $113.9 million, while natural disaster-related allocations totalled $84.2 million. Funding allocated specifically to respond to life-saving needs in the light of the global food crisis amounted to $72.4 million.

[1] Financial figures reflect funds approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator as at 30 June 2009 and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.

[2] See General Assembly resolutions 60/124 and 46/182.

[3] Collectively referred to as "agencies" or "humanitarian agencies" in the present report.

4. The $84.2 million allocated to rapid response projects related to natural disasters during the reporting period was significantly less than the approximately $124 million committed in the previous reporting cycle (July 2007-June 2008). This was at least partially due to the occurrence of fewer large-scale natural disasters in the period under review. In addition, allocations categorized as responding to the global food crisis may have captured some grants that previously could have been categorized as being for natural disasters.[4] Of the amount allocated, approximately $57 million was in response to needs resulting from floods, droughts or hurricanes. Funding for programmes to combat outbreaks of disease, such as the cholera epidemic in Zimbabwe early in 2009, accounted for approximately $16.9 million, up from $10.6 million in the previous reporting period. Earthquake-related allocations were reduced significantly, from over $15 million in the previous reporting period to less than $2 million. Another $2.6 million in rapid-response grant allocations was approved to respond to pest outbreaks, such as locust infestations. Table 2 provides a breakdown of funding provided from the Central Emergency Response Fund in response to natural disasters, per calendar year, since the inception of the grant element in 2006.

Table 2
Central Emergency Response Fund rapid-response funding in response to natural disasters
(millions of United States dollars)[a]

	15 March 2006 to 30 June 2006	*1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007*	*1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008*	*1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009*	*Total (by type of disaster)*
Floods/droughts/hurricanes/ cyclones	14.3	90.1	93.7[b]	57.0[b]	**255.1**[c]
Disease	1.2	16.7	10.6	16.9	**45.4**
Earthquakes	—	0.7	15.3	2.0	**18**
Pest outbreaks	—	1.3	2.0	2.6	**5.9**
Heat/cold wave	—	—	2.4	5.7	**8.1**
Total	**15.5**	**108.8**	**124**	**84.2**	**332.5**

[a] Financial figures reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.
[b] This does not include funding allocated to drought-affected countries in 2008 through the Central Emergency Response Fund reserve for the global food crisis.
[c] Some $89.8 million of this total was allocated in response to droughts.

5. In May 2008, demonstrating the flexibility of the Fund as a tool to address global challenges in a rapid manner, the Emergency Relief Coordinator established a reserve of $100 million from existing rapid-response resources to cover needs stemming from the global food crisis. The $72.4 million which was allocated from this reserve through the rapid response window was in response to requests for some $255.5 million in 2008 by resident/humanitarian coordinators in 30 countries to address emergency needs resulting from the food crisis. By the end of 2008,

[4] Natural disasters, such as drought, were one of many factors contributing to the global food crisis.

humanitarian agencies operating in 26 countries had received allocations to support 87 projects in eight different clusters/sectors to ensure a comprehensive, multi-sector response. The three largest recipients of funds from the reserve were the World Food Programme (WFP) (some $50 million), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (some $20 million) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (some $20 million). In total, nearly 18 million people affected by rising food prices and shrinking safety nets benefited from these funds from the reserve. In 2009, grant requests related to the ongoing food crisis have been reviewed on a rolling basis, given that the Emergency Relief Coordinator did not set aside another specific reserve. Numerous project proposals in 2009, particularly through the underfunded window, have included reference to the ongoing needs stemming from the food crisis.

6. During the reporting cycle, the Emergency Relief Coordinator allocated $99.8 million to 19 countries through the underfunded window in order to strengthen key elements of humanitarian response in crises that had attracted insufficient donor support. The Emergency Relief Coordinator makes funds available from the underfunded window in semi-annual rounds. Allocation decisions are based on a wide range of data and consultation processes to determine which countries would most benefit, due emphasis being placed on humanitarian needs and principles. Within the selected countries, the resident/humanitarian coordinator leads an inter-agency process to prioritize needs and propose projects to be funded through the Central Emergency Response Fund. Typically, the Emergency Relief Coordinator, in consultation with the resident coordinator and agencies at the country level, aims to commit a larger proportion of the underfunded allocations in the first annual round. Having the funds at the beginning of the year enables country-level partners to plan the use of their resources better. The second round, which is typically smaller, is aimed at addressing remaining unmet needs midway through the year. For example, in 2008, $101.7 million was allocated in the first underfunded round, while $26.6 million was allocated in the second round. In 2009, $75 million was allocated to the first round and $55 million has gone towards the second.

7. As recommended in the two-year evaluation of the Central Emergency Response Fund, the Fund secretariat, together with humanitarian agency partners, is currently carrying out a review of the underfunded window processes, which will result in updated guidelines for allocating funds and improvements in the management of the allocation process. These guidelines will be fully implemented for the 2010 underfunded rounds.

8. The loan element of the Fund, which was its original element, is available as a cash flow mechanism when funds expected from donors have not yet been received. However, during the reporting cycle, no formal requests for loans were submitted. Disbursements were made for two loans, totalling $30 million, for WFP projects in Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo which had been approved prior to the reporting period.[5] Both loans were reimbursed in full during the reporting period. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs is considering how to utilize the Central Emergency Response Fund loan element in conjunction with country-based pooled funds, particularly emergency response funds; the goal would

[5] These loans were included in the previous report (A/63/348).

be to ensure sufficient cash flow at the onset of an emergency for small, localized initiatives in countries where such funds exist.

III. Key results based on objectives

9. In line with the humanitarian reform aim of ensuring that emergency response is more timely and predictable, the Central Emergency Response Fund has three primary objectives: promoting early action and response to reduce loss of life, enhancing response to time-critical requirements, and strengthening core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises (see resolution 60/124, para. 15). In line with these objectives, emergency operations of 14 humanitarian agencies working in 11 clusters/sectors were funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund (see figs. I and II below). These agencies worked with numerous humanitarian partners, including Governments and national and international non-governmental organizations, to carry out critical projects aimed at addressing life-saving needs. Examples of action of the Fund with regard to each of its three primary objectives are provided below.

A. Promoting early action and response

10. Through the Fund, agencies have the means to start or scale up operations to promote early action and improve overall humanitarian response. UNICEF, one of the largest recipients of funds from the Central Emergency Response Fund, received $94.9 million during the reporting cycle to carry out essential response activities in a number of clusters/sectors, including water and sanitation, health and nutrition, education and child protection. The Fund continues to work well in conjunction with the UNICEF internal loan facility, the Emergency Programme Fund, which allows disbursement within 24 hours. As one example, in November 2008, the humanitarian country team in Sri Lanka requested funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund for urgently required assistance focused on internally displaced persons in the north of the country. UNICEF received approximately $1.2 million to help ensure a coordinated response and address the needs of the most vulnerable, working closely with other humanitarian partners. UNICEF activities included the provision of hygiene kits to nearly 8,000 families and the improvement of drinking water and sanitation facilities in nine camps for internally displaced persons. In addition, enough temporary learning shelters and child friendly spaces were constructed to serve at least 1,800 children and to provide access to basic nutrition services, including management of acute malnutrition in children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating women in targeted areas. UNICEF reported that it had reached over 60,000 beneficiaries in Sri Lanka in 2008 through activities funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund, coupled with other funding. In 2009, as the humanitarian situation in Sri Lanka rapidly deteriorated, UNICEF received a further $6.1 million, out of a total $21 million allocated to Sri Lanka through the rapid response window in 2009, to carry out 10 projects supporting the affected populations.

11. The humanitarian situation of Nepal, one of the most vulnerable countries in the Asian and Pacific region, deteriorated in October 2008 when conflict, displacement and chronic poverty were exacerbated by rising food insecurity and

severe flooding. The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) intervened in the acute emergency phase to provide essential reproductive health services, gender-based violence screening and HIV/AIDS awareness for internally displaced persons and refugees in the flood-affected areas. In addition to establishing a mobile clinic, UNFPA distributed reproductive health equipment, drugs and supplies, as well as hygiene kits. Approximately 5,000 individuals, 70 per cent of them women, received medical and reproductive health services and gender-based violence counselling. Activities provided under projects funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund were supplemented by UNFPA core resources and programmes. All relief activities were guided by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's gender handbook and guidelines on gender-based violence interventions in humanitarian settings.

12. WFP received support through the rapid response window to respond to flooding and landslides in Central America in 2008 that left thousands displaced and vulnerable to malnutrition and disease. Through the use of approximately $600,000 from the Central Emergency Response Fund, WFP provided 721 metric tons of food commodities to meet the immediate food needs of 34,000 flood-affected people in Guatemala. Further, working with implementing partners in Honduras, WFP reached 100 per cent of the beneficiaries targeted (40,150 people), thus averting increased rates of acute malnutrition among the flood-affected population.

13. In August 2008, an influx of Somali refugees into the eastern part of Ethiopia strained that country's ability to provide safe refuge. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) received $1.5 million from the Fund to address vital needs of newly arriving refugees, including support to open two new camps (Aw Barre and Shedder). Approximately 1,700 new shelters were constructed and, since most refugees had crossed the border without any belongings, plastic sheeting, kitchen sets, soap, sanitary napkins, cooking stoves and fuel, blankets, nets and jerrycans were distributed. The provision of fuel-saving stoves had a special impact on the lives of women and girls, as they no longer had to travel outside of the camp to collect firewood, which previously had exposed them to harmful situations, such as sexual and gender-based violence.

14. To save the lives of those affected by the earthquake and offer them support during the harsh winter in Balochistan, Pakistan, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) designed and distributed an emergency transitional winter shelter before the first heavy snowfall of the season arrived. The shelter was adapted on the basis of feedback from beneficiary communities, Government authorities and cluster members. Locally procured resources were used, which contributed to stimulating the local economy. The shelters helped prevent massive migration, as they allowed displaced families to remain relatively close to their homes. UN-Habitat reports that the project, funded with a rapid response Central Emergency Response Fund grant of $886,923, played a catalytic role and had a multiplier effect in leveraging additional funds to expand coverage. Based on this response, the shelter has become a model winter shelter and UN-Habitat has been asked by the Government of Pakistan to assist with more permanent housing solutions for affected communities.

15. In May 2009, as the humanitarian situation in Pakistan quickly deteriorated because of increased violence, the Central Emergency Response Fund approved funding through the rapid response window to respond to the growing crisis of the internally displaced. Within this allocation, WFP received $2.7 million to provide

urgently needed food assistance to internally displaced persons living inside and outside of camps in the North-West Frontier Province. With that funding, complemented by funding from other sources, WFP aimed to provide essential food assistance to internally displaced persons in eight districts where over 600,000 internally displaced persons were located.

16. During the reporting period, UNDP received a total of $4.5 million to address life-saving needs in a number of clusters/sectors, including: agriculture/livelihoods, water and sanitation, shelter and non-food items and critical infrastructure repair. In Cameroon and Sri Lanka, for example, UNDP received Fund resources that made the prompt strengthening of the United Nations security management structure in the country possible, thus enabling the safe delivery of essential humanitarian assistance to severely affected populations.

B. Enhancing response to time-critical requirements

17. The Central Emergency Response Fund can be an essential funding tool not only in the case of sudden disasters, but also in situations where a time-critical response can prevent a crisis from escalating into a full-fledged disaster, thereby reducing its overall cost and impact in the longer term. In April 2009, the Fund committed, in its first regional allocation, time-critical funding to FAO to respond to an infestation of red locusts in Malawi, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania. The infestation could potentially have affected the livelihoods of more than 15 million people in central, eastern, and southern Africa. With the support of a rapid-response grant of $1.9 million, FAO was able to mobilize quickly and, within one month, had already treated nearly 14,000 hectares, mostly using environmentally friendly bio-pesticide, to ensure containment of the locust infestation. Major swarm escapes and invasions of cropping areas were averted. The project also relied on close collaboration with other humanitarian partners, including non-governmental organizations in the region.

18. Central Emergency Response Fund financing often serves to fill gaps in financing or jump-start projects that require immediate support in a limited, critical period. This was the case in Niger when an outbreak of meningitis was declared in June 2008. Central Emergency Response Fund funding to the World Health Organization (WHO) was combined with support from national authorities and international non-governmental organizations to supply vaccines and carry out a vital vaccination campaign in 10 districts. In the Birnin Konni district, the campaign resulted in 80 per cent coverage of the population in only three weeks, causing the number of meningitis cases to decrease significantly and helping contain the outbreak. Overall, through the coordinated efforts of WHO, the Government and non-governmental organizations, nearly 800,000 people were vaccinated and 2,262 people were treated for meningitis.

19. Speed of Central Emergency Response Fund response continues to be a priority. During the reporting period, rapid-response grant requests required an average of three days from final submission to approval by the Emergency Relief Coordinator. In sudden onset crises, the processing time for the approval of grants can be even further reduced. For example, early in 2009, during the crisis in Gaza, the Emergency Relief Coordinator approved five rapid-response projects, totalling approximately $7 million, on the same day the requests were submitted to the Fund

secretariat. Up to 200,000 people affected by fighting directly benefited from the projects funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund, which included support for safe drinking water, emergency shelter and fuel, and ready-made meals. In Sri Lanka, the humanitarian country team made two separate project requests in February and May 2009 to support critical emergency response activities in conflict-affected areas of the country. It took one day for the Emergency Relief Coordinator to approve these requests, for a combined total of over $21 million.

C. Strengthening core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises

20. The third objective of the Fund, strengthening response for underfunded crises, involves providing support for relief activities in countries that, despite significant humanitarian needs, have not received adequate attention from the donor community. Allocations made through the underfunded window also promote greater predictability and equity in humanitarian financing, often enabling the continuation of critical but chronically under-supported aspects of an emergency response, increasing coverage and strengthening humanitarian coordination. In 2008, 11 of the 20 countries receiving funds through the underfunded window participated in the consolidated appeals process. Allocations through the underfunded rounds can ensure more equitable funding of consolidated appeals, including for underfunded clusters/sectors. In 2008, the clusters/sectors receiving the largest share of funds through the underfunded rounds were health and nutrition (24 per cent), food (20 per cent), shelter/non-food items (14 per cent) and water and sanitation (13 per cent).

21. In 2008, the humanitarian crisis in Zimbabwe worsened as poor water supply, sanitation and hygiene led to outbreaks of diarrhoea and cholera. By early 2008, there were more than 10,000 cases of diarrhoea and more than 120 cases of cholera; yet the humanitarian community had insufficient resources to respond to growing emergency needs. The Emergency Relief Coordinator selected Zimbabwe for a grant through the underfunded window. IOM received support from the Fund in March for projects in multiple clusters/sectors. In the health and water and sanitation clusters/sectors, IOM, along with a number of non-governmental organizations, coordinated activities for some 32,000 beneficiaries affected by cholera and diarrhoea. With additional funding received from the Fund in April 2009, under-supported activities, including training of community health volunteers and health staff, improving cross-border disease surveillance, prevention and case management, could be maintained or started. The construction of temporary pit latrines and the rehabilitation of water points at border areas and in communities of mobile and vulnerable populations were carried out. In the education sector, IOM increased access to quality education for approximately 19,000 children in such communities.

22. Chronic shortcomings in the humanitarian response to the crisis in Afghanistan led the Emergency Relief Coordinator to allocate grants totalling $8.8 million to humanitarian agencies through the underfunded window in 2008. These grants responded to the needs of approximately 160,000 internally displaced persons and returning refugees suffering from drought and harsh weather conditions. Assessments found that some 1.15 million people were at risk of drinking water shortages, malnutrition and displacement, while the 2008 Afghanistan Joint Emergency Appeal remained significantly underfunded at only 49 per cent coverage.

IV. Administration and management of the Central Emergency Response Fund

A. The Central Emergency Response Fund secretariat

23. The Emergency Relief Coordinator's role as fund manager is supported by the Central Emergency Response Fund secretariat, which is situated within the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (see ST/SGB/2006/10). The secretariat's duties include reviewing and processing funding proposals, developing and providing policy guidance, consulting closely with agencies and partners, coordinating inter-agency processes, carrying out public information and reporting functions, supporting resident/humanitarian coordinators in accessing funds from the Central Emergency Response Fund, supporting the Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group, and managing the Fund's database and website. In order to carry out these functions, and at the recommendation of the Advisory Group, the secretariat has increased in size and capacity, now having 23 posts, including three seconded staff, one each from UNHCR, WFP and FAO. This has brought about notable improvements in the speed and effectiveness of the Fund, particularly in terms of processing grant requests, supporting country-level processes and improved reporting, information-sharing and communication. For example, the Fund secretariat enhanced its process for reviewing all annual narrative reports on projects funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund carried out in 2008, to ensure better tracking of progress on real achievements versus expected results as outlined in project proposals.

24. To facilitate quality and accountability standards, the secretariat provides training, guidance and support to various stakeholders on how to access and report on funds provided from the Central Emergency Response Fund. Training is offered to agency partners and non-governmental organizations at the regional and field levels. Regular training for humanitarian partners has improved the speed and quality of the proposals and reports submitted to the Fund and helped improve its overall efficiency and effectiveness. During the reporting cycle, approximately 470 United Nations, IOM, national and international non-governmental organization, Red Cross Movement and Government representatives at the field, regional and headquarters levels participated in 11 Central Emergency Response Fund workshops. Eight workshops were held at the regional level, two at the headquarters level and one at the country level. Approximately 15 per cent of the participants were from non-governmental organizations. Sessions on humanitarian financing and the Central Emergency Response Fund were carried out for all humanitarian coordinators and included in regional resident coordinators' workshops.

25. In order to promote accessibility, transparency and accountability, the Central Emergency Response Fund secretariat maintains a website (http://cerf.un.org) providing up-to-date information on how to apply for funding, current and previous Central Emergency Response Fund allocations and reports from resident/humanitarian coordinators on all projects funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund. The secretariat has made a practice of posting all relevant documentation online in a timely manner, including notes from Advisory Group meetings and information for contributors to the Fund. In 2009, the secretariat has also developed a communications strategy with the aim of explaining and promoting better the work of the Fund to further allow information to be shared transparently with stakeholders.

B. The Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group

26. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/124, independent experts serve as members of the Advisory Group, to provide policy advice and guidance to the Secretary-General, through the Emergency Relief Coordinator, on the use and impact of the Fund. The Advisory Group met twice during the reporting period including, for the first time, holding a meeting with the United Nations Controller. Also for the first time, one third of the members rotated out of the Advisory Group and the appointment of new members was announced by the Secretary-General. During the Advisory Group meeting in April 2009, the members expressed satisfaction that the $450 million funding target for the Central Emergency Response Fund set by the General Assembly had been exceeded in 2008. They noted that, because of the global economic crisis, 2009 might be a challenging year, and called upon Member States to make every effort to increase their political and financial support of the Fund. The Advisory Group also attached great importance to progress made regarding the recommendations resulting from the two-year evaluation of the Fund, and the development of a performance and accountability framework to ensure accountability and demonstrate the value added of the Fund.

27. At the meeting of the Advisory Group in April 2009, members of the Group pressed for urgent improvements in the funding relationship between United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations. They requested the Emergency Relief Coordinator to put that issue on the agenda of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, since it could not be resolved by the Advisory Group itself. In response, the Emergency Relief Coordinator communicated to Inter-Agency Standing Committee principals in May 2009 the suggestion that the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group take up that issue.

C. Inter-agency consultations

28. Consultations with agencies regarding the Fund continue to take place regularly through Inter-Agency Standing Committee structures, as well as at the working level through the Central Emergency Response Fund inter-agency group and the Central Emergency Response Fund partnership task force. Twenty-five inter-agency meetings were held during the reporting period, allowing for discussions on both operational and policy issues, including the preparation of the management response matrix for the recommendations resulting from the two-year evaluation, and the preparation of the present report. The Central Emergency Response Fund partnership task force continued to meet to discuss issues relating to arrangements for funds sub-granted from agencies to non-governmental organizations, and to prepare background materials for two Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group sessions on humanitarian financing and partnership issues in November 2008 and July 2009.

29. During the first half of 2009, inter-agency discussions focused on a possible reconfiguration of the consultation architecture. The Central Emergency Response Fund inter-agency group, having worked through a number of the key operational and policy issues, has gradually become more of an information-sharing forum. The partnership task force served as a useful platform for dialogue and information-sharing, resulting, for example, in the preparation of a set of targeted recommendations and a mapping of United Nations/IOM partnership frameworks.

However, its mandate prevented it from moving forward, given the technical nature of partnership/contractual issues and the fact that those issues are not specific to the Fund.

30. The Fund secretariat therefore led a process aimed at reviewing the issues that required sustained attention and rationalizing the number of bodies and meetings. One relevant factor was the establishment in late 2008 of the Funding Coordination Section within the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to support country-based pooled funds. This created a new opportunity to engage Inter-Agency Standing Committee organizations at the headquarters level on issues relating to country-based pooled funds as well as to the Central Emergency Response Fund.

31. In consultation with agency and non-governmental organization partners, a proposal was put forward to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group in June 2009 to create an Inter-Agency Standing Committee group on humanitarian financing, which would consider both the Central Emergency Response Fund and country-based pooled funds, with the overall aim of leading to a more coherent and integrated system. This would help limit the consultation architecture and ensure that inter-agency discussions on key issues take place with the right profile of representation.

D. Improvements in the Central Emergency Response Fund operational framework, including progress on the recommendations resulting from the two-year evaluation

32. In his previous report (A/63/348), the Secretary-General detailed key findings and recommendations of the General Assembly-mandated independent review of the Fund at the end of its second year of operation. He did not include a response to the 37 strategic and operational recommendations made, since the final evaluation report was officially circulated only in September 2008. The Fund secretariat prepared a management response matrix in November 2008 in consultation with United Nations agencies, IOM, non-governmental organizations and the office of the United Nations Controller. The matrix serves as a road map for the work that needs to be completed before the next evaluation of the Fund in 2011. It details the response and action to be taken for each recommendation, and is updated and shared with Member States, the Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group and organizations of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on a semi-annual basis. The most recent update of the matrix was completed and circulated in April 2009.

33. Of the recommendations made, 22 have been accepted, 8 partially accepted, 1 rejected and 6 are pending. Implementation of a number of the recommendations is under review and discussion within the United Nations Secretariat. Other recommendations relating to United Nations/IOM-non-governmental organization funding/contractual arrangements require the attention of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group or other forums for implementation. The Emergency Relief Coordinator has asked the Inter-Agency Standing Committee principals to work together to address long-standing partnership issues, particularly those highlighted by the Central Emergency Response Fund evaluation, adopting a more comprehensive agency-wide approach.

34. Discussions around the management response matrix provide an opportunity to continue to strengthen the operational framework of the Fund and to address

remaining challenges. The Fund secretariat is leading an inter-agency process aimed at revising the Secretary-General's Bulletin on the establishment and operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund (ST/SGB/2006/10), in order to take into account findings from the evaluation, as well as experience gained after three years of the Fund's operation. The changes to the bulletin will focus on refining the operational guidance on the use, management and administration of the Fund, including clarification of the role of the Emergency Relief Coordinator; the definition of the implementation period and the time frame for the delivery of goods and services; the field-driven nature of the application process and the central role played by resident/humanitarian coordinators in establishing priorities for funding; loan procedures; and oversight, accountability and reporting requirements. Consultations with the agencies and the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts of the Department of Management began in May 2009. The revised bulletin is expected to enter into force by the end of 2009.

35. A revised bulletin is a prerequisite to moving forward on an umbrella letter of understanding, the development of which is being undertaken in parallel to the revision of the bulletin. This umbrella agreement is aimed at improving the timeliness of funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund by streamlining the administrative steps in the disbursement of grants. An umbrella letter of understanding would consist of a standard agreement between the Emergency Relief Coordinator and each eligible recipient, eliminating project-specific letters of understanding except in certain circumstances. Discussions on the agreement are continuing and a number of issues related to financial reporting and accountability will be finalized in the coming months. The umbrella letter of understanding is expected to be in use by early 2010.

36. A number of performance measures and accountability tools (such as the Fund's website, database and reporting framework) that have been put into place since the inception of the grant element of the Fund need to be integrated into a comprehensive framework. In line with recommendations resulting from the evaluation, the process for the development of a performance and accountability framework is under way. An initial proposal was submitted to the Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group in April 2009 and was refined following feedback from it. The framework will map out the responsibilities of the multiplicity of stakeholders in the accountability and performance of the Fund, such as the Emergency Relief Coordinator, the United Nations Controller, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Central Emergency Response Fund secretariat, the Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group, the General Assembly and Member States, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee organizations, resident/humanitarian coordinators and United Nations country teams. It will outline accountability tools for the use and management of resources, as well as measures to assess the Fund's performance against the three objectives set out in General Assembly resolution 60/124, which established the grant element. The framework will be in place by the end of 2009.

37. The Fund's secretariat, in consultation with agency partners and the global cluster leads, is in the process of revising the guidelines on life-saving criteria with the overall aim of clarifying the types of humanitarian activity that fall within the Fund's mandate, a process that will be finalized by the end of 2009. The revision will promote better targeting of funds from the Central Emergency Response Fund, based on clearer prioritization of needs.

V. Trends and analysis

A. Regional funding

38. During the reporting period, sub-Saharan Africa received the highest percentage of funding (57.4 per cent), followed by Asia and the Caucasus (26.1 per cent), Latin America and the Caribbean (9.0 per cent) and the Middle East (7.5 per cent). Within sub-Saharan Africa, some $100 million was allocated to crises in East Africa and the Horn of Africa, approximately one fourth of all grants allocated by the Central Emergency Response Fund. Table 3 illustrates grant requests and approvals at the regional and subregional levels. Allocations (including rapid-response and underfunded grants) for natural disasters were fairly evenly distributed along regional lines: Latin America and the Caribbean ($28.7 million), Asia ($24.7 million) and Africa ($32.9 million).[6]

Table 3
Central Emergency Response Fund grant allocations by region and subregion (1 July 2008-30 June 2009)[a]

	Grants requested (millions of United States dollars)	*Grants approved (millions of United States dollars)*	*Approval (as a percentage of total allocations)*
Africa	**285.0**	**215.0**	**57.4**
East Africa and Horn of Africa	123.3	100.1	26.7
Great Lakes and Central Africa	59.4	43.9	11.7
Southern Africa	46.1	39.8	10.6
West Africa	56.1	31.1	8.3
Asia and the Caucasus	**112.0**	**97.5**	**26.1**
Caucasus	3.0	3.0	0.8
East Asia	14.0	13.4	3.6
South Asia	68.9	57.3	15.3
South-East Asia	13.0	11.1	3.0
South-West (Central) Asia	13.2	12.7	3.4
Caribbean and Latin America	**39.9**	**33.7**	**9.0**
Caribbean	23.8	22.5	6.0
Central America	6.3	3.0	0.8
South America	9.8	8.1	2.2
Middle East	**29.7**	**28.2**	**7.5**
Total	**466.6**	**374.3**	**100**

[a] Financial figures reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.

[6] Allocations to the Middle East for natural disasters totalled approximately $5 million.

B. Funding of clusters/sectors

39. The Central Emergency Response Fund committed funding towards 11 clusters/sectors during the reporting period (see fig. I). As in previous years, the food ($99.6 million, 26.6 per cent) and health and nutrition ($97.9 million, 26.2 per cent) clusters/sectors continued to receive the highest amount of funding from the Fund, followed by water and sanitation ($40.8 million, 10.9 per cent). Nearly 10 per cent of funding was allocated to the agricultural sector during the reporting period, an increase compared with previous reporting periods that illustrates the importance of critical support to small holder livelihoods. The Fund also endeavours to support underfunded sectors that are increasingly recognized as essential aspects of humanitarian response efforts, including emergency education and protection/human rights/rule of law. While the total amounts allocated to these clusters/sectors are often significantly smaller than for other clusters/sectors, supporting them is critical to ensuring a more effective response overall.

Figure I
Central Emergency Response Fund grant allocations by clusters/sectors



Note. Financial figures reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.

[a] Multi-sector largely constitutes funding for refugee assistance programmes.

C. Agency funding

40. Fourteen humanitarian agencies received direct support for emergency activities in the reporting period. Two agencies, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and UN-Habitat received Central Emergency Response Fund allocations for the first time. As in previous cycles, the three agencies receiving the largest amounts of support were WFP ($128.6 million),

UNICEF ($94.9 million) and UNHCR ($40.2 million). Projects carried out by these agencies span a number of clusters/sectors, including food assistance, education, health and nutrition, shelter and non-food items, and water and sanitation.

Figure II
Central Emergency Response Fund grant allocations by agency


Central Emergency Response Fund grants allocated by agency, 1 July 2008-30 June 2009
(in United States dollars)
WHO 33 679 003
WFP 128 561 395
UNRWA 4 491 432
UNOPS 2 492 262
UNIFEM 66 340
UNICEF 94 937 746
UNHCR 40 196 036
UNFPA 8 191 634
UNESCO 411 516
UNDP 4 462 673
UN-HABITAT 1 938 219
OHCHR 40 376
IOM 18 694 005
FAO 36 169 554

Note: Financial figures reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual United Nations certified financial values.

D. Further observations

41. With commitments of approximately $25 million, the Central Emergency Response Fund has emerged as a particularly important and effective tool for jump-starting critical common humanitarian services for relief operations, such as humanitarian air services, logistics and security services for humanitarian partners. Efficient common humanitarian services can significantly affect how agencies go about their work and are an essential component of providing emergency assistance. In the Central African Republic, for example, funds from the Central Emergency Response Fund for the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service allowed staff from 40 humanitarian organizations to reach isolated regions across the country and deliver over 18 tons of critical cargo during three months of Central Emergency Response Fund support. The Fund secretariat, in consultation with WFP, which operates the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service, is currently finalizing guidelines on future use of the Fund to finance the activities of the Service, to ensure that the Fund is not seen as a source of continuing funding.

42. In 2008,[7] the Central Emergency Response Fund provided funding in response to all 12 flash appeals. Some 73 per cent of the amount allocated was approved before or within two weeks of the appeal launch (see table 4). In 2006 and 2007, funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund covered, on average, approximately 17.5 per cent of requirements included in the flash appeals. In 2008, Fund coverage of flash appeal requirements decreased to approximately 6 per cent of the total amount requested.[8]

Table 4
Timeliness of funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund to flash appeals, as a percentage of total Central Emergency Response Fund allocations to flash appeals per calendar year

	2006	*2007*	*2008*	*2009 (at 30 June)*
Funding before or within two weeks of launch of appeal	45%	87%	73%	50%
Funding three to four weeks after launch of appeal	23%	6%	10%	—
Funding more than four weeks after launch of appeal	31%	7%	17%	50%

43. In 2008, contributions from the Central Emergency Response Fund covered approximately 3 per cent of the total requirements originally requested in consolidated appeals. In terms of the total funds actually contributed in response to consolidated appeals, funding provided by the Fund accounted for 7.2 per cent of the total funds received. From 2006 to 2008, funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund to countries with a consolidated appeal process declined, while its funding to countries without a consolidated appeal process steadily increased.[9]

44. The importance of gender mainstreaming is increasingly acknowledged within the humanitarian community and is prioritized in the context of the Central Emergency Response Fund. Gender mainstreaming is encouraged with all humanitarian agencies that receive funding from, and in all Central Emergency Response Fund projects funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and tools on mainstreaming gender in humanitarian action have been used in implementing many projects. In order to promote greater gender equity in projects funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund, the 2008 reporting requirements were updated to include, among other things, gender disaggregated data and information on how gender mainstreaming was incorporated in each project at the country level. Information provided in the reports will enable a more comprehensive effort to be made to mainstream gender in projects funded from the Central Emergency Response Fund.

[7] Analysis on funding from the Central Emergency Response Fund in response to consolidated appeals and flash appeals is based on figures that were available as at 16 April 2009.

[8] Some of this shift can be explained by the more than tripling of flash appeal requirements in 2008 to $1.2 billion, as compared to $386 million in 2007.

[9] Central Emergency Response Fund funding to non-consolidated appeal process countries had disproportionately increased in 2008 as a result of disbursements from the Central Emergency Response Fund food crisis reserve.

VI. Funding levels

45. The General Assembly has set a $450 million annual funding goal for the Central Emergency Response Fund. In 2008, this goal was surpassed for the first time when $453 million was contributed by 74 Member States, one Permanent Observer and six private organizations.

46. In order to share information, engage in policy discussion and generate support for the Central Emergency Response Fund for 2009, a high-level conference was organized in New York on 4 December 2008. By 30 June 2009, as a result of this conference and other resource mobilization activities, nearly $388 million had been pledged by 73 Member States and one Permanent Observer, and approximately $241 million had been made available in contributions. Owing to fluctuations in exchange rates for the United States dollar, and the economic downturn, it will be a challenge to reach the $450 million target for 2009. Nonetheless, it is a sign of the strong support for the Fund that 20 Member States increased their contributions in their respective national currencies, while only nine Member States decreased their contributions.

47. Since 2006, 107 Member States and Observers have pledged to the Fund, well over half of the membership of the General Assembly. In 2008 and the first half of 2009, 30 Member States contributed to the Fund for the first time. In keeping with the intended management of the Fund, at the end of 2008, a carry-over balance of at least $30 million was maintained in order to be able to respond in the case of a sudden emergency.

48. In 2009, the high-level conference will be held in December to discuss developments concerning the Fund and to solicit support for its financing for 2010. In keeping with the purpose of the Fund, contributions to it should be additional to commitments to humanitarian programming and resources dedicated to international development cooperation, and Member States should continue to support humanitarian agencies directly on a bilateral basis as well as through the Fund.

49. The effects of the global economic crisis on humanitarian financing are still far from clear. The Fund secretariat, in coordination with other humanitarian financing mechanisms, has been monitoring pledges and contributions closely, while also advocating for Member States to maintain contributions at the level of previous years.

VII. Conclusions

50. The Fund has continued to be an essential part of the multilateral humanitarian financial architecture, enabling agencies to jump-start relief operations following sudden-onset disasters, filling gaps in time-critical emergencies and increasing the coverage of needs in crises facing funding shortfalls. In response to the recommendations resulting from the two-year evaluation of the Fund, the Central Emergency Response Fund Advisory Group and the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the Fund secretariat has continued to improve its operations, financial management and reporting. Improvements have resulted in increased transparency and accountability to Member States, humanitarian partners and the general public.

51. The management response matrix based on the recommendations resulting from the two-year evaluation serves as a road map for the Fund, with the objective of continuing to increase its effectiveness and improve its operations. Looking

forward, the Fund secretariat will focus on developing and implementing a performance and accountability framework, further reducing transaction costs through simplification and harmonization of procedures, reviewing and improving guidance materials, implementing new communication and resource mobilization strategies, strengthening partnerships with non-governmental organizations and addressing a number of issues related to administrative and financial procedures and reporting arrangements. Further, the secretariat will continue to strengthen the Fund's complementarity with other humanitarian financing mechanisms, including country-based pooled funds and agency emergency funds.

52. There are many challenges ahead for the international humanitarian community. The full impact of the global economic crisis is still unknown, but, combined with other major global trends such as climate change, could result in an increase in emergency, life-saving needs, accompanied by a stagnation or even reduction of humanitarian aid budgets. Vulnerable groups in developing countries are likely to bear the brunt of the impact, possibly resulting in migration, increased food insecurity and social unrest. Governments will likely be under pressure to reduce spending on overseas aid programmes, including humanitarian aid. Emergency needs may also grow as a result of the increasing frequency, unpredictability and severity of weather-related events, the continuing effects of the food crisis in many developing countries, and other trends, such as population growth and urbanization, as well as the continuation of complex emergencies like those in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia and the Sudan.

53. Whatever the impact of these challenges, the Central Emergency Response Fund will continue to play a central role in ensuring a rapid and well-coordinated response that meets the needs of the most vulnerable throughout the world. Member States are reminded of the $450 million annual funding goal set by the General Assembly and also of the need to maintain support for a diversity of humanitarian funding tools. Enhanced political and financial support is required to maintain the viability of the Fund and meet the ever-increasing challenges ahead. The Fund needs this support to be better able to promote a more predictable, timely, equitable, accountable, impartial and effective humanitarian response.

Annex I

Total contributions to the Central Emergency Response Fund, 1 January 2008 to 30 June 2009

(United States dollars)

	2008	2009	
Contributor	*Received*	*Pledged*	*Received*
Afghanistan	—	1 440.00	—
Albania	3 000.00	3 500.00	3 500.00
Algeria	10 000.00	10 000.00	10 000.00
Andorra	33 494.90	31 744.80	31 744.80
Antigua and Barbuda	5 000.00	5 000.00	5 000.00
Argentina	30 000.00	30 000.00	—
Armenia	5 000.00	5 000.00	5 000.00
Australia	9 517 000.00	7 821 600.00	7 821 600.00
Austria	1 030 055.00	421 940.93	—
Bangladesh	5 000.00	—	—
Belgium	2 539 594.30	6 476 500.00	—
Benin	—	1 500.00	1 500.00
Bhutan	1 480.00	1 480.00	1 480.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5 000.00	—	—
Botswana	5 000.00	—	—
Brazil	50 000.00	99 985.00	99 985.00
Bulgaria	10 000.00	15 000.00	—
Canada	39 037 522.76	31 850 960.00	8 704 281.57
Chile	100 000.00	20 000.00	20 000.00
China	500 000.00	500 000.00	500 000.00
Croatia	34 000.00	24 000.00	24 000.00
Czech Republic	153 874.56	154 710.00	—
Denmark	9 931 472.84	8 544 087.49	8 544 087.49
Ecuador	20 000.00	—	—
Egypt	15 000.00	15 000.00	15 000.00
Estonia	91 200.00	80 845.00	80 845.00
Finland	7 791 000.00	8 198 400.00	8 198 400.00
France	2 223 046.38	—	—
Germany	14 790 000.00	19 522 484.38	19 522 484.38
Ghana	—	10 000.00	—
Greece	300 000.00	500 000.00	500 000.00
Guatemala	10 000.00	—	—
Guyana	4 912.84	—	—
Hungary	20 000.00	54 088.00	54 088.00
Holy See[a]	5 000.00	5 000.00	—
Iceland	611 243.27	—	—

Contributor	2008	2009	
	Received	*Pledged*	*Received*
India	—	500 000.00	—
Indonesia	100 000.00	125 000.00	—
Ireland	33 301 074.00	25 906 000.00	12 802 974.00
Israel	15 000.00	15 000.00	15 000.00
Italy	2 935 400.00	1 358 868.00	1 358 868.00
Jamaica	—	5 000.00	5 000.00
Japan	2 169 083.18	1 000 000.00	1 000 000.00
Kazakhstan	50 000.00	50 000.00	50 000.00
Kenya	—	10 000.00	—
Republic of Korea	2 000 000.00	3 000 000.00	2 000 000.00
Kuwait	50 000.00	50 000.00	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	—	3 000.00	3 000.00
Latvia	20 000.00	—	—
Liechtenstein	196 136.12	230 840.26	230 840.26
Lithuania	20 844.62	—	—
Luxembourg	6 190 400.00	5 181 200.00	—
Malaysia	100 000.00	100 000.00	—
Mexico	100 000.00	150 000.00	—
Monaco	139 313.48	129 530.00	—
Montenegro	2 500.00	4 975.00	4 975.00
Morocco	5 000.00	5 000.00	5 000.00
Mozambique	—	2 000.00	—
Myanmar	—	10 000.00	10 000.00
Namibia	—	1 000.00	1 000.00
Netherlands	63 900 000.00	55 668 000.00	55 668 000.00
New Zealand	1 000 000.00	1 000 000.00	1 000 000.00
Norway	55 258 765.36	42 734 982.73	42 734 982.73
Oman	—	30 000.00	30 000.00
Pakistan	20 000.00	15 000.00	15 000.00
Peru	10 000.00	—	—
Philippines	5 000.00	10 000.00	10 000.00
Poland	300 000.00	300 000.00	—
Portugal	312 400.00	263 020.00	263 020.00
Qatar	—	10 050 000.00	50 000.00
Saint Lucia	—	1 000.00	—
Samoa	—	2 000.00	—
San Marino	4 412.74	—	—
Saudi Arabia	100 000.00	150 000.00	150 000.00
Slovenia	50 000.00	50 000.00	—
South Africa	221 538.45	180 000.00	—

Contributor	2008	2009	
	Received	*Pledged*	*Received*
Spain	45 531 968.00	38 860 103.63	—
Sri Lanka	9 982.00	10 132.85	—
Sweden	56 264 400.17	49 367 572.36	49 367 572.36
Switzerland	7 241 824.57	4 657 370.02	4 657 370.02
Syrian Arab Republic	5 000.00	—	—
Thailand	20 000.00	—	—
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	2 000.00	—	—
Timor-Leste	—	1 200.00	1 200.00
Trinidad and Tobago	20 000.00	20 000.00	—
Tunisia	5 000.00	—	—
Turkey	300 000.00	200 000.00	200 000.00
Tuvalu	—	1 000.00	1 000.00
United Arab Emirates	50 000.00	—	—
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	80 239 000.00	61 444 000.00	14 780 000.00
United States of America	5 000 000.00	—	—
Viet Nam	—	10 000.00	—
Alexander Bodini	10 000.00	15 000.00	15 000.00
Disaster Resource Network	5 000.00	—	—
Humanity First USA	2 500.00	—	—
Private donations through United Nations Foundation[b]	718 201.00	156 030.00	156 030.00
SCOR Group	200 000.00	—	—
Abu Dhabi National Energy Company (TAQA)	—	150 000.00	150 000.00
The Estate of George Gary	—	10 408.05	10 408.05
Private donations outside the United Nations Foundation	3 514.92	—	—
Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates	—	9 981.50	9 981.50
Total	**453 093 155.46**	**387 608 480.00**	**240 899 218.16**

Notes:

(1) Amounts received are recorded at the exchange rate in effect on the day the deposit is received and may differ from pledged due to fluctuations in exchange rates.

(2) Amounts stated do not constitute official United Nations financial records.

(3) At the date of preparation of the report, outstanding pledges from Canada, Mexico, Mozambique, the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom had been honoured, but have not been included in the total as the contributions were received after 30 June 2009.

[a] The Holy See is an observer State.

[b] Includes contributions from Western Union and PriceWaterhouseCoopers.

Annex II

Total committed funds from the Central Emergency Response Fund, 1 January 2008 to 30 June 2009[a]

(United States dollars)

	2008			2009		
Country	*Rapid response*	*Underfunded*	*Total committed*	*Rapid response*	*Underfunded*	*Total committed*
Afghanistan	9 446 560.00	8 774 084.00	18 220 644.00	4 165 567.00	—	4 165 567.00
Angola	1 498 653.00	—	1 498 653.00	2 354 123.00	—	2 354 123.00
Bangladesh	1 000 000.00	—	1 000 000.00	—	—	—
Bolivia	2 271 874.00	—	2 271 874.00	—	—	—
Burkina Faso	2 000 293.00	3 399 999.00	5 400 292.00	1 650 443.00	1 997 535.00	3 647 978.00
Burundi	1 600 013.00	3 587 934.00	5 187 947.00	—	3 956 773.00	3 956 773.00
Cameroon	4 720 260.00	2 000 006.00	6 720 266.00	—	—	—
Comoros	534 037.00	—	534 037.00	—	—	—
Central African Republic	3 387 014.00	—	3 387 014.00	187 355.00	—	187 355.00
Chad	5 507 547.00	6 766 433.00	12 273 980.00	1 998 660.00	—	1 998 660.00
China	8 045 731.00	—	8 045 731.00	—	—	—
Colombia	1 838 333.00	—	1 838 333.00	3 135 341.00	4 999 979.00	8 135 320.00
Côte d'Ivoire	5 072 073.00	7 002 959.00	12 075 032.00	—	2 000 003.00	2 000 003.00
Cuba	7 367 516.00	—	7 367 516.00	—	—	—
Djibouti	5 580 667.00	—	5 580 667.00	—	1 996 905.00	1 996 905.00
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1 398 170.00	1 999 884.00	3 398 054.00	—	9 999 909.00	9 999 909.00
Democratic Republic of the Congo	3 000 022.00	38 106 996.00	41 107 018.00	12 950 354.00	—	12 950 354.00
Eritrea	2 996 242.00	—	2 996 242.00	—	1 999 999.00	1 999 999.00
Ethiopia	21 876 887.00	9 651 153.00	31 528 040.00	—	9 666 134.00	9 666 134.00
Georgia	2 995 315.00	—	2 995 315.00	—	—	—
Guatemala	1 483 541.00	—	1 483 541.00	—	—	—
Guinea-Bissau	1 201 967.00	—	1 201 967.00	—	—	—
Guinea	3 999 178.00	—	3 999 178.00	1 450 000.00	—	1 450 000.00
Haiti	16 030 104.00	—	16 030 104.00	—	4 995 766.00	4 995 766.00
Honduras	1 501 344.00	—	1 501 344.00	—	—	—
India	3 010 825.00	—	3 010 825.00	—	—	—
Iraq	6 636 654.00	5 000 001.00	11 636 655.00	1 004 837.00	—	1 004 837.00
Jordan	3 543 119.00	—	3 543 119.00	—	—	—
Kenya	19 563 931.00	6 406 348.00	25 970 279.00	13 298 355.00	—	13 298 355.00
Kyrgyzstan	1 970 556.00	—	1 970 556.00	—	—	—

Country	2008			2009		
	Rapid response	*Underfunded*	*Total committed*	*Rapid response*	*Underfunded*	*Total committed*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2 024 378.00	—	2 024 378.00	—	—	—
Lebanon	1 008 582.00	—	1 008 582.00	—	—	—
Lesotho	1 895 820.00	—	1 895 820.00	574 955.00	—	574 955.00
Liberia	1 900 000.00	—	1 900 000.00	—	—	—
Madagascar	6 490 800.00	—	6 490 800.00	6 450 994.00	—	6 450 994.00
Mali	—	3 198 972.00	3 198 972.00	—	—	—
Malawi	—	—	—	544 860.00	—	544 860.00
Mauritania	1 132 595.00	—	1 132 595.00	—	—	—
Mexico	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mozambique	4 839 160.00	—	4 839 160.00	547 001.00	—	547 001.00
Myanmar	26 417 370.00	2 019 979.00	28 437 349.00	—	2 998 439.00	2 998 439.00
Namibia	—	—	—	1 299 825.00	—	1 299 825.00
Nepal	6 643 120.00	5 997 698.00	12 640 818.00	—	—	—
Niger	3 754 643.00	6 499 999.00	10 254 642.00	1 426 230.00	3 976 342.00	5 402 572.00
Nigeria	—	—	—	1 279 887.00	—	1 279 887.00
Occupied Palestinian Territory	4 988 364.00	—	4 988 364.00	9 409 055.00	—	9 409 055.00
Pakistan	11 911 265.00	6 808 525.00	18 719 790.00	8 890 399.00	—	8 890 399.00
Philippines	2 080 292.00	—	2 080 292.00	—	—	—
Republic of the Congo	—	2 011 654.00	2 011 654.00	—	—	—
Somalia	11 721 943.00	—	11 721 943.00	—	9 999 999.00	9 999 999.00
Sri Lanka	8 501 410.00	3 995 382.00	12 496 792.00	21 250 277.00	—	21 250 277.00
Sudan	16 025 254.00	—	16 025 254.00	16 986 029.00	—	16 986 029.00
Syrian Arab Republic	6 966 175.00	624 741.00	7 590 916.00	—	—	—
Tajikistan	7 647 237.00	—	7 647 237.00	—	—	—
Togo	2 074 049.00	—	2 074 049.00	—	—	—
Uganda	5 681 929.00	—	5 681 929.00	1 191 321.00	—	1 191 321.00
United Republic of Tanzania	499 958.00	—	499 958.00	1 371 563.00	—	1 371 563.00
Yemen	8 206 847.00	—	8 206 847.00	—	4 705 281.00	4 705 281.00
Zimbabwe	6 988 475.00	4 493 657.48	11 482 132.48	7 899 348.00	9 982 000.00	17 881 348.00
Total	**300 478 092.00**	**128 346 404.48**	**428 824 496.48**	**121 316 779.00**	**73 275 064.00**	**194 591 843.00**

Note: **Committed funds reflect project amounts approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and do not reflect actual certified financial values.**

[a] **Funding approved by the Emergency Relief Coordinator.**

Annex III

Central Emergency Response Fund Loans, 1 January 2008 to 30 June 2009

(United States dollars)

Agency	*Country*	*Amount*
WFP	Democratic Republic of the Congo	3 750 000.00
WFP	Ethiopia	26 250 000.00
Total		**30 000 000.00**